

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
for
IMPLEMENTATION OF A LIGHT GOOSE HUNTING
PLAN FOR SQUAW CREEK NATIONAL WILDLIFE

Abstract: The Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge, comprising 7,441 acres, was established in 1935 as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife. The refuge is located in Holt County in northwestern Missouri, along the east side of the Missouri River floodplain. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is proposing to implement a guided light goose hunt, during the spring light goose conservation order hunting season, on a 236 acre portion of the refuge. The purpose of this hunt is to facilitate an increase in the harvest of the mid-continent population of light geese while providing quality recreational hunting opportunities on the refuge. Alternatives considered in this proposal include: (A) Open a Portion of the Refuge to Guided Hunting During the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season, (B) No action, (C) Open a Portion of the Refuge to Unlimited Public Hunting During the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season, and (D) Open a Portion of the Refuge to Limited Public Hunting During the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season. Alternative (A) was the preferred alternative based on the refuge's need to control access in order to maximize the light goose harvest while providing a quality hunting experience for hunt participants at a minimal cost to the refuge.

Responsible Agency and Official:

Robyn Thorson, Regional Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building
1 Federal Drive
Fort Snelling, MN 55111

Contacts for additional information about this project:

Ron Bell, Refuge Manager
Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge
PO Box 158
Mound City, MO 64470
(660) 442-5754 x 13

Frank Durbian, Wildlife Biologist
Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge
PO Box 158
Mound City, MO 64470
(660) 442-5754 x 17

Table of Contents

1. Purpose and Need for Action.....	6
1.1 Purpose.....	6
1.2. Need.....	6
1.3. Decisions that Need to be Made.....	6
1.4. Background.....	6
2. Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action.....	7
2.1 Alternatives not Considered for Detailed Analysis.....	7
2.2 Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis.....	8
2.2.1 Alternative A (Proposed Action).....	8
2.2.2 Alternative B (No Action).....	8
2.2.3 Alternative C.....	8
2.2.4 Alternative D.....	9
2.3 Summary of Alternative Actions (Table).....	10
3. Affected Environment.....	10
3.1 Physical Characteristics.....	10
3.2 Biological Environment.....	11
3.2.1 Habitat/Vegetation.....	11
3.2.2 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species.....	11
3.3.3 Other Wildlife Species.....	12
3.3 Land Use.....	12
3.4 Cultural/Paleontological Resources.....	12
3.5 Local Socio-economic Conditions.....	12

4. Environmental Consequences.....	13
4.1. Alternative A (Proposed Action).....	13
4.1.1 Habitat Impacts.....	13
4.1.2 Biological Impacts.....	13
4.1.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species.....	14
4.1.4 Cultural Resources.....	14
4.1.5 Environmental Justice.....	14
4.1.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	14
4.1.7 Public Use.....	14
4.1.8 Socioeconomics.....	15
4.1.9 Public Perception.....	15
4.2. Alternative B (No Action).....	15
4.2.1 Habitat Impacts.....	15
4.2.2 Biological Impacts.....	15
4.2.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species.....	16
4.2.4 Cultural Resources.....	16
4.2.5 Environmental Justice.....	16
4.2.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	16
4.2.7 Public Use.....	16
4.2.8 Socioeconomics.....	16
4.2.9 Public Perception.....	16
4.3. Alternative C.....	16
4.3.1 Habitat Impacts.....	16

4.3.2 Biological Impacts.....	17
4.3.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species.....	17
4.3.4 Cultural Resources.....	17
4.3.5 Environmental Justice.....	17
4.3.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	17
4.3.7 Public Use.....	18
4.3.8 Socioeconomics.....	18
4.3.9 Public Perception.....	18
4.4 Alternative D.....	19
4.4.1 Habitat Impacts.....	18
4.4.2 Biological Impacts.....	19
4.4.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species.....	19
4.4.4 Cultural Resources.....	19
4.4.5 Environmental Justice.....	19
4.4.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	19
4.4.7 Public Use.....	20
4.4.8 Socioeconomics.....	20
4.4.9 Public Perception.....	20
4.5 Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative (Table).....	21
5. List of Preparers.....	25
6. Consultation and Coordination with the Public and Others.....	25
7. Public Comment on Draft EA/EIS and Response.....	25
8. References Cited.....	25

Figure 1.....	27
Appendices.....	28

DRAFT

1. Purpose and Need for Action

1.1 Purpose

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is proposing to implement a light goose hunting plan on Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge (SCNWR) during the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. The purpose of this hunt is to increase the total harvest of the mid-continent population of light geese while providing wildlife dependant recreation on the refuge.

1.2 Need

The following needs have been identified relative to the implementation of the SCNWR Light Goose Hunting Plan:

- There is a need to decrease the current mid-continent population of light geese in order to reduce catastrophic destruction of their arctic breeding ground habitat.
- There is a need for quality, wildlife dependant, public outdoor recreation that is consistent with the Refuge's purpose.

1.3 Decisions that Need to be Made

The Regional Director of the Great Lakes/Big Rivers Region will consider the information presented in this document and will be responsible for determining the action to be taken in this proposal by choosing an alternative. The Regional Director will determine whether the selected alternative is a major Federal action that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. If it is determined not to be a major Federal action, a Finding of No Significant Impact will be issued. A Decision of Significant Impact will indicate the need to conduct more detailed environmental analysis in an Environmental Impact Statement.

1.4 Background

The mid-continent population of light geese (MCP), which includes the lesser snow goose (*Chen caerulescens*) and Ross' goose (*Chen rossi*), has been increasing at an estimated average rate of 5%/year (Abraham et al., 1996). Similarly, the winter index of the MCP has increased from 777,000 in 1970 to 2,400,000 in 2000 (Sharp and Moser, 2000). Currently the North American Waterfowl Management Plan population goal and the joint Central and Mississippi Flyway Council upper management thresholds have been exceeded (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2004). This annual rate of increase has resulted in extensive damage to the arctic breeding grounds due to over-grazing/grubbing by geese, which has a direct impact on the MCP as well as other bird species that utilize these breeding grounds. The many problems associated with this "over-grazing" are well documented by Batt et al. (1997) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2004). The U.S

Fish and Wildlife Service, together with the Canadian Wildlife Service, Ducks Unlimited and state wildlife officials are working together to address this problem with the formation of the Arctic Goose Habitat Working Group who's purpose is to provide recommendations for a solution. Although many methods were recommended by the group to achieve the goal of population reduction, sport hunting was the preferred method. Hunting was selected because harvest by hunters is an acceptable utilization of this resource and hunters are considered "a highly motivated, well equipped and economical labor force ... with a widely demonstrated commitment to waterfowl conservation" (Batt et al., 1997). The use of hunting as a tool to control the MCP was also supported by a majority of the participants in the MCP workshops held throughout the central and Mississippi flyways (Arnold, 1997).

In an effort to increase harvest of the MCP the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service implemented a light goose conservation order (64 FR 7517 and Arctic Tundra Habitat Emergency Conservation Act, 1999) that permits the hunting of light geese, with fewer restrictions, during a new spring season. This extra harvest beyond the traditional fall/winter hunting season is expected to help reduce population growth of the MCP to sustainable levels.

The recommended harvest level needed to decrease the MCP 50% by 2005 was 1,410,000 geese/year (Rockwell and Ankey, 2000). During the 1999/2000 hunting season approximately 1,488,633 geese were harvested from the MCP, slightly exceeding the recommended harvest level (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2004). Any harvest beyond the recommended level will likely reduce the amount of time needed to reach populations goals.

2. Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action

Alternatives were developed that are consistent with a combination of Service needs including control of the expanding mid-continent population of light geese, public recreational use of the refuge, protection of visitor safety, and minimizing the impact to other wildlife species, including Federal threatened and endangered species, utilizing the refuge. A "No Action" alternative was also listed to highlight the potential consequences of no action being taken. All alternatives were formulated by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff.

2.1 Alternatives not Considered for Detailed Analysis

Opening the entire refuge to light goose hunting was considered as a possible alternative. Although this may increase the light goose harvest on the refuge, it would negatively impact a majority of the wildlife species using the refuge, including threatened and endangered species; refuge habitat; and public use. This alternative was not evaluated in detail as a majority of the affects would be catastrophically negative and inconsistent with the Refuge's purpose.

2.2 Alternatives Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis

2.2.1 Alternative A (Proposed Action): Open a Portion of the Refuge to Guided Hunting During the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season.

Under this alternative a guided hunt will be implemented during the spring light goose conservation order which typically takes place from January 25th through April 30th. This hunt will focus on maximizing the harvest of light geese, specifically Lesser Snow Geese, by allowing guided hunting on a 235 acre portion of the Refuge (Figure 1). A single guide will be selected, through a bidding and application process, each year. The selected guide will be responsible for taking hunters on the refuge to hunt in accordance with refuge specific regulations as mentioned in the Refuge Light Goose Hunting Plan (Appendix 1); and state and federal hunting regulations. During the spring light goose conservation order light geese may be harvested and possessed in any number, and hunters may use electronic calls and unplugged shotguns from ½ hour before sunrise until ½ hour after sunset.

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity.

2.2.2 Alternative B (No Action): Do not Implement a Light Goose Hunting Plan

Under this alternative a refuge light goose hunting plan will not be implemented and no light goose hunting will take place on the refuge.

2.2.3 Alternative C: Open a Portion of the Refuge to Unlimited Public Hunting During the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season.

Under this alternative unlimited public hunting will take place on the refuge during the spring light goose conservation order which typically takes place from January 25th through April 30th. This hunt will focus on maximizing the harvest of light geese, specifically lesser snow geese, by allowing unlimited public hunting on a 235 acre portion of the Refuge (Figure 1). An unlimited number of hunters will be allowed to hunt light geese on the hunt site in accordance with refuge specific regulations; and state and federal hunting regulations. During the

spring light goose conservation order light geese may be harvested and possessed in any number, and hunters may use electronic calls and unplugged shotguns from ½ hour before sunrise until ½ hour after sunset.

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity.

2.2.4 Alternative D: Open a Portion of the Refuge to Limited Public Hunting During the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season.

Under this alternative limited public hunting will take place on the refuge during the spring light goose conservation order which typically takes place from January 25th through April 30th. This hunt will focus on maximizing the harvest of light geese, specifically lesser snow geese, by allowing limited public hunting on a 235 acre portion of the Refuge (Figure 1). The hunt will be conducted by refuge staff and will be limited to one group of not more than 10 hunters per day who will be selected through a daily, random, drawing process. Each hunting group must hunt in accordance with refuge specific regulations; and state and federal hunting regulations. During the spring light goose conservation order light geese may be harvested and possessed in any number, and hunters may use electronic calls and unplugged shotguns from ½ hour before sunrise until ½ hour after sunset.

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude Bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity.

2.3 Summary of Alternative Actions

Table 1. Summary of alternative actions.

Alternative A (Proposed Alternative)	Alternative B (No Action)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Under this alternative a guided hunt will be implemented on a 235 acre portion of the Refuge during the spring light goose conservation order. A single guide will be selected, through a bidding and application process, each year. The selected guide will be responsible for taking hunters on the refuge to hunt.	Under this alternative a refuge light goose hunting plan will not be implemented and no light goose hunting will take place on the refuge.	Under this alternative limited public hunting will take place on a 235 acre portion of the Refuge during the spring light goose conservation order. An unlimited number of hunters will be allowed to hunt light geese on the hunt site.	Under this alternative limited public hunting will take place on a 235 acre portion of the Refuge during the spring light goose conservation order. The hunt will be conducted by refuge staff and will be limited to one group of not more than 10 hunters per day who will be selected through a daily, random, drawing process.

3. Affected Environment

Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge was established under the authorities of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929 and the Migratory Bird Hunting Act of 1934. Signed into existence by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as the “Squaw Creek Migratory waterfowl Refuge” on August 23, 1935, in Executive Order 7156, the Refuge’s purpose was to “...effectuate further the purpose of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.” The Executive Order further stated that the lands are to be used “as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife.”

3.1 Physical Characteristics

Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge is located in Holt County in northwestern Missouri, approximately half way between Kansas City, Missouri and Omaha, Nebraska, 2.5 miles west of Interstate Highway 29. The Refuge gets its name from Squaw Creek, a major stream that drains the Loess Hills on the east and flows through the Missouri River floodplain portion of the refuge via a man-made ditch, and then empties into the Missouri River approximately 8 miles south of the refuge. Davis Creek, which has also been ditched, flows along the eastern refuge boundary and joins Squaw Creek just after leaving the refuge. The Refuge’s west boundary is about 5 miles from the closest bank of the

Missouri River. The Santa Fe-Burlington Northern railroad grade runs along the west boundary of the Refuge.

3.2 Biological Environment

3.2.1 Habitat/Vegetation

The refuge contains 7,441 acres of wetlands; wet and mesic prairie; bottomland and upland forest; and agricultural cropland. It lies in the floodplain of the Missouri River and extends into the Loess Hill region of northwestern Missouri.

The floodplain habitat includes approximately 6,700 acres of managed wetlands, grasslands, riparian habitats, and agricultural fields; including Missouri's largest wet prairie remnant (938 acres) which is located in the center of the Refuge. Refuge lowlands were once part of a large natural marsh in the Missouri River floodplain.

The approximately 740 acres of Refuge uplands include a segment of the 200-mile long band of bluffs known as the Loess Hills. The Loess Hills support rare remnants of native prairie and prairie associated wildlife along with oak-hickory dominated deciduous forest.

3.2.2 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species

Three Federal threatened/endangered species and one Federal candidate species use the refuge. These include the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), least tern (*Sterna antillarum*), and eastern massasauga rattlesnake (*Sistrurus catenatus*).

The piping plover and least tern are occasional visitors of the refuge with approximately 2-3 sightings per/year. They typically do not occur on the refuge during the spring light goose conservation order hunting season and they do not use the agricultural cropland on the refuge. Encounters between these species and hunt participants is highly unlikely. These temporal and spatial differences, relative to the location and timing of the proposed hunting activity, preclude them from being negatively impacted by such activity. An Intra-Service Section 7 Biological Evaluation resulted in a "No Effect" determination for both species (Appendix 2).

Eastern Massasauga Rattlesnakes do not use the agricultural cropland on the refuge and are hibernating during a significant portion of the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. Encounters between this species and hunt participants is highly unlikely. These temporal and spatial differences, relative to the location and timing of the proposed hunting activity, preclude them from being negatively impacted by such activity. An Intra-Service Section 7 Biological Evaluation resulted in a "No Effect" determination for this species (Appendix

2).

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. This species, which is migrating during the same time period as light geese and other waterfowl, are abundant on the refuge during this time period. Up to 144 bald eagles have been recorded on the refuge during the spring migration and breeding period. One pair of bald eagles has continually nested and fledged several young on the refuge over the past 8 years.

To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity. An Intra-Service Section 7 Biological Evaluation resulted in a “May Effect But Not Likely To Adversely Effect Species/Critical Habitat” determination for bald eagles (Appendix 2).

3.2.3 Other Wildlife Species

The Refuge hosts 310 species of birds, 33 mammals, and 35 reptiles and amphibians. Other species of wildlife that commonly utilize the agricultural cropland in the proposed hunt area include white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) and wild turkeys (*Meleagris gallopavo*).

3.3 Land Use

The proposed hunting area (Figure 1) is currently in agricultural production which includes a 2-year rotation of corn and soybeans. All farming of this site is accomplished through the Refuge’s cooperative farming program.

The land uses immediately adjacent to the proposed hunting area (Figure 1) include Refuge native prairie, other Refuge agricultural lands; and private agricultural lands.

3.4 Cultural/Paleontological Resources

No known archaeological or cultural resources are located on the hunt area, which has been in agricultural production for over 20 years. Additionally, conduct of the hunt will not involve any significant soil disturbance.

3.5 Local Socio-economic Conditions

Based upon 2000 census data (or as indicated), Holt County can be characterized by the following statistics:

- Population 5,268 (2001 data)
- 99.1 percent are caucasian with a balance of other races
- Median age is 41.8
- 26.2 percent are 19 years old or younger
- 24.2 percent are 62 years old or older
- 81.9 percent of persons over 25 years old are high school graduates
- 11.7 percent of persons over 25 years old have a bachelors degree or higher
- Farmland (1997) 231,040 acres (78 percent of county area)
- Personal income per capita \$15,876
- Median household income \$29,461

Locally, the economy is based primarily on agriculture with some small business, light industry, government and recreation. In Holt County 78% of the land is in agricultural production. The major agricultural crops include corn and soybeans. The recreational portion of the economy is based heavily on hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing and other recreational opportunities, many of which are directly or indirectly dependant on the Refuge.

4. Environmental Consequences

4.1. Alternative A (Proposed Action)

4.1.1 Habitat Impacts

This alternative will have no impact on Refuge habitat.

This alternative may result in additional MCP light geese being harvested during the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season. This will have a positive affect on the arctic breeding ground habitat and the associated wildlife species.

4.1.2 Biological Impacts

White-tailed deer typically inhabit this area at night, while they are feeding on waste grain, and should not be impacted by the proposed hunting activity. Wild turkeys commonly utilize this area during the day but should not be impacted by the proposed hunting activity as there are several hundred acres of agricultural fields on the refuge that they can alternatively utilize and several thousand acres of agricultural fields immediately adjacent to the Refuge that they may also utilize.

This alternative may result in a negative, short term, impact on MCP of light geese but a long term positive benefit through the overall reduction of the population.

4.1.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity.

4.1.4 Cultural Resources

The proposed hunting activity will have no negative impact on known archaeological and cultural resources.

4.1.5 Environmental Justice

The proposed hunting activity will have no impact on minority populations.

Low income populations, who can not afford to pay for a guided hunt, may be adversely affected by this action. This is mitigated by the presence of other public lands, including 7,115 acres of state managed lands, within a 15 mile radius of the Refuge, that allow snow goose hunting during the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season without any related access fees. This land base includes Bob Brown Conservation Area (3,302 acres) located approximately 5 miles southwest of the Refuge and Nodaway Valley Conservation Area (3,813 acres) located approximately 10 miles east of the Refuge.

4.1.6 Cumulative Impacts

Other off-refuge light goose hunting mortality combined with hunting mortality from this alternative may result in a larger harvest of the MCP. The additional harvest attributed to this alternative may decrease the time necessary to reduce the MCP to population levels that the arctic breeding ground habitat can support which may, in turn, prevent additional damage to this habitat.

4.1.7 Public Use

Guided hunting will result in a quality hunting experience for hunt participants and decrease potential hunter safety issues.

There is limited potential for conflict with other recreational uses, especially wildlife viewing, during the hunt period. The use of a designated hunting area

away from the auto tour route and a hunter parking area away from other public use areas will mitigate any potential impact.

Hunting pressure may impact the number and duration of stay for light geese using the Refuge. This may, in turn, affect wildlife viewing opportunities. The reaction of light geese to this hunt will be closely monitored by refuge staff and appropriate measures, including closing the hunt, will be implemented if necessary to mitigate any impact.

4.1.8 Socioeconomics

This alternative will reduce the need for additional refuge staff time for managing the hunt and will meet the current refuge staffing plan and budget.

This alternative may have a positive impact on the local community by increasing the amount of local goods and services purchased by hunters participating in the proposed hunting activity.

4.1.9 Public Perception

Recreational hunting is widely accepted in the local area. Limited conflict is expected from the non-consumptive recreational public that utilizes the refuge. Complaints will serve as an opportunity to educate the public about the light goose problem and the use of hunting as a wildlife management tool.

Other limited public conflict may include complaints from owners/users of local duck clubs neighboring the Refuge and local hunters who may be concerned with the potential effects of the refuge light goose hunting program on their own hunting properties or opportunities. Complaints will serve as opportunities to educate the public about hunting as a compatible use of the refuge and as a wildlife management tool.

4.2. Alternative B (No Action)

4.2.1 Habitat Impacts

This alternative will have no impact on Refuge habitat.

This alternative may result in a slower recovery time for the arctic breeding ground habitat.

4.2.2 Biological Impacts

This alternative will have no biological impact on the Refuge.

This alternative will not result in the additional harvest of the MCP of light geese.

4.2.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species

This alternative will have no impact on listed, proposed and candidate species.

4.2.4 Cultural Resources

This alternative will have no impact on archaeological and cultural resources.

4.2.5 Environmental Justice

This alternative will have no impact minority and low income populations.

4.2.6 Cumulative Impacts

This alternative will have no cumulative impacts.

4.2.7 Public Use

This alternative will have no impact on existing public uses of the refuge. However this alternative will not result in any new public use opportunities on the Refuge.

4.2.8 Socioeconomics

This alternative will have no impact on the refuge budget or local socioeconomics.

4.2.9 Public Perception

This alternative may negatively impact public perception of the refuge by those who question why we are not having a light goose hunt on the refuge in order to do our part to address the light goose problem.

4.3. Alternative C

4.3.1 Habitat Impacts

This alternative will have no impact on Refuge habitat.

This alternative may result in additional MCP light geese being harvested during the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season. This will have a positive affect on the arctic breeding ground habitat and the associated wildlife species.

4.3.2 Biological Impacts

White-tailed deer typically inhabit this area at night, while they are feeding on waste grain, and should not be impacted by the proposed hunting activity. Wild turkeys commonly utilize this area during the day but should not be impacted by the proposed hunting activity as there are several hundred acres of agricultural fields on the refuge that they can alternatively utilize and several thousand acres of agricultural fields immediately adjacent to the Refuge that they may also utilize.

This alternative may result in a negative, short term, impact on MCP of light geese but a long term positive benefit through the overall reduction of the population.

4.3.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity.

4.3.4 Cultural Resources

The proposed hunting activity will have no negative impact on known archaeological and cultural resources.

4.3.5 Environmental Justice

This alternative will have no impact minority and low income populations.

4.3.6 Cumulative Impacts

Other off-refuge light goose hunting mortality combined with hunting mortality from this alternative may result in a larger harvest of the MCP. The additional harvest attributed to this alternative may decrease the time necessary to reduce the MCP to population levels that the arctic breeding ground habitat can support which may, in turn, prevent additional damage to this habitat.

4.3.7 Public Use

Unlimited public hunting on the proposed light goose hunting area will greatly decrease hunt quality and increase potential hunter safety issues.

There is limited potential for conflict with other recreational uses, especially wildlife viewing, during the hunt period. The use of a designated hunting area away from the auto tour route and a hunter parking area away from other public use areas will mitigate any potential impact.

Hunting pressure may impact the number and duration of stay for light geese using the Refuge. This may, in turn, affect wildlife viewing opportunities. The reaction of light geese to this hunt will be closely monitored by refuge staff and appropriate measures, including closing the hunt, will be implemented if necessary to mitigate any impact.

4.3.8 Socioeconomics

This alternative will result in an increased need for refuge staff time in order to monitor the hunt and may result in fiscal and personnel needs that exceed the current refuge staffing plan and budget.

This alternative may have a positive impact on the local community by increasing the amount of local goods and services purchased by hunters participating in the proposed hunting activity.

4.3.9 Public Perception

Recreational hunting is widely accepted in the local area. Limited conflict is expected from the non-consumptive recreational public that utilizes the refuge. Complaints will serve as an opportunity to educate the public about the light goose problem and the use of hunting as a wildlife management tool.

Other limited public conflict may include complaints from owners/users of local duck clubs neighboring the Refuge and local hunters who may be concerned with the potential effects of the refuge light goose hunting program on their own hunting properties or opportunities. Complaints will serve as opportunities to educate the public about hunting as a compatible use of the refuge and as a wildlife management tool.

4.4 Alternative D

4.4.1 Habitat Impacts

This alternative will have no impact on Refuge habitat.

This alternative may result in additional MCP light geese being harvested during the Spring Light Goose Conservation Order Hunting Season. This will have a positive affect on the arctic breeding ground habitat and the associated wildlife species.

4.4.2 Biological Impacts

White-tailed deer typically inhabit this area at night, while they are feeding on waste grain, and should not be impacted by the proposed hunting activity. Wild turkeys commonly utilize this area during the day but should not be impacted by the proposed hunting activity as there are several hundred acres of agricultural fields on the refuge that they can alternatively utilize and several thousand acres of agricultural fields immediately adjacent to the Refuge that they may also utilize.

This alternative may result in a negative, short term, impact on MCP of light geese but a long term positive benefit through the overall reduction of the population.

4.4.3 Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species

The bald eagle is the only federal threatened or endangered species that actively utilizes the refuge during the time period coinciding with the spring light goose conservation order hunting season. To mitigate any possible disturbance to bald eagles, the hunt boundaries were constructed at least one-quarter of a mile from known perching and roosting sites and one and one-half miles from the nesting site to avoid disturbing bald eagles. The daily duration of the proposed hunting activity is also limited to one-half day to decrease potential disturbance to bald eagles. These mitigation factors should preclude bald eagles from being negatively impacted by the proposed hunting activity.

4.4.4 Cultural Resources

The proposed hunting activity will have no negative impact on known archaeological and cultural resources.

4.4.5 Environmental Justice

This alternative will have no impact minority and low income populations.

4.4.6 Cumulative Impacts

Other off-refuge light goose hunting mortality combined with hunting mortality from this alternative may result in a larger harvest of the MCP. The additional harvest attributed to this alternative may decrease the time necessary to reduce the MCP to population levels that the arctic breeding ground habitat can support

which may, in turn, prevent additional damage to this habitat.

4.4.7 Public Use

Limited public hunting on the proposed light goose hunting area will result in a quality hunting experience for hunt participants and decrease potential hunter safety issues.

There is limited potential for conflict with other recreational uses, especially wildlife viewing, during the hunt period. The use of a designated hunting area away from the auto tour route and a hunter parking area away from other public use areas will mitigate any potential impact.

Hunting pressure may impact the number and duration of stay for light geese using the Refuge. This may, in turn, affect wildlife viewing opportunities. The reaction of light geese to this hunt will be closely monitored by refuge staff and appropriate measures, including closing the hunt, will be implemented if necessary to mitigate any impact.

4.4.8 Socioeconomics

This alternative will result in a greatly increased need for refuge staff time in order to regulate hunter numbers by having daily hunter access drawings. This will also result in fiscal and personnel needs that exceed the current refuge staffing plan and budget.

This alternative may have a positive impact on the local community by increasing the amount of local goods and services purchased by hunters participating in the proposed hunting activity.

4.4.9 Public Perception

Recreational hunting is widely accepted in the local area. Limited conflict is expected from the non-consumptive recreational public that utilizes the refuge. Complaints will serve as an opportunity to educate the public about the light goose problem and the use of hunting as a wildlife management tool.

Other limited public conflict may include complaints from owners/users of local duck clubs neighboring the Refuge and local hunters who may be concerned with the potential effects of the refuge light goose hunting program on their own hunting properties or opportunities. Complaints will serve as opportunities to educate the public about hunting as a compatible use of the refuge and as a wildlife management tool.

4.5 Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative

Table 2. Comparison of impacts by issue and alternative.

Issue	Alternative A Guided Light Goose Hunt (Proposed Alternative)	Alternative B No Action	Alternative C Unlimited Public Hunting	Alternative D Limited Public Hunting
Habitat Impacts	No impact on Refuge habitat. This alternative may have a positive impact on the artic breeding ground habitat.	No impact on Refuge habitat. This alternative may result in a <u>slower</u> recovery for the artic breeding ground habitat.	No impact on Refuge habitat. This alternative may have a positive impact on the artic breeding ground habitat.	No impact on Refuge habitat. This alternative may have a positive impact on the artic breeding ground habitat.
Biological Impacts	This alternative may result in a negative, short term, impact on MCP of light geese but a long term positive benefit through the overall reduction of the population.	This alternative will not result in the additional harvest of the MCP of light geese.	This alternative may result in a negative, short term, impact on MCP of light geese but a long term positive benefit through the overall reduction of the population.	This alternative may result in a negative, short term, impact on MCP of light geese but a long term positive benefit through the overall reduction of the population.
Listed, Proposed and Candidate Species	Potential impact on the bald eagle that is mitigated by the placement of the hunt area.	No impact.	Potential impact on the bald eagle that is mitigated by the placement of the hunt area.	Potential impact on the bald eagle that is mitigated by the placement of the hunt area.
Cultural Resources	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.

Table 2 Continued.

Issue	Alternative A Guided Light Goose Hunt (Proposed Alternative)	Alternative B No Action	Alternative C Unlimited Public Hunting	Alternative D Limited Public Hunting
Environmental Justice	This alternative may negatively impact low income populations that can not afford a guided hunt. This is mitigated by the presence of other public lands near the refuge that allow free public access for light goose hunting.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Cumulative Impacts	This alternative may result in a larger cumulative harvest of MCP light geese which may decrease the recovery time of the artic breeding ground habitat.	No impact.	This alternative may result in a larger cumulative harvest of MCP light geese which may decrease the recovery time of the artic breeding ground habitat.	This alternative may result in a larger cumulative harvest of MCP light geese which may decrease the recovery time of the artic breeding ground habitat.

Table 2 Continued.

Issue	Alternative A Guided Light Goose Hunt (Proposed Alternative)	Alternative B No Action	Alternative C Unlimited Public Hunting	Alternative D Limited Public Hunting
Public Use	<p>This alternative will result in a quality hunting experience.</p> <p>Conflict with other public uses is limited.</p> <p>Hunting pressure may impact the number and duration of stay for light geese. This will be monitored and appropriate action taken if necessary.</p>	<p>This alternative will not result in any new public use opportunities on the Refuge.</p>	<p>This alternative will result in a <u>poor</u> quality hunting experience and increased hunter safety issues.</p> <p>Conflict with other public uses is limited.</p> <p>Hunting pressure may impact the number and duration of stay for light geese. This will be monitored and appropriate action taken if necessary.</p>	<p>This alternative will result in a quality hunting experience.</p> <p>Conflict with other public uses is limited.</p> <p>Hunting pressure may impact the number and duration of stay for light geese. This will be monitored and appropriate action taken if necessary.</p>
Socioeconomics	<p>This alternative will reduce the need for additional refuge staff time for managing the hunt and will meet the current refuge staffing plan and budget.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>	<p>This alternative will result in an increased need for refuge staff time and may result in fiscal and personnel needs that exceed the current refuge staffing plan and budget.</p>	<p>This alternative will result in fiscal and personnel needs that exceed the current refuge staffing plan and budget.</p>

Table 2 Continued.

Issue	Alternative A Guided Light Goose Hunt (Proposed Alternative)	Alternative B No Action	Alternative C Unlimited Public Hunting	Alternative D Limited Public Hunting
Socioeconomics (Continued)	This alternative may have a positive impact on the local economy.		This alternative may have a positive impact on the local economy.	This alternative may have a positive impact on the local economy.
Public Perception	<p>Limited conflict is expected from the non-consumptive recreational public that utilizes the refuge.</p> <p>Other limited public conflict may include complaints from owners/users of local duck clubs neighboring the Refuge and local hunters who may be concerned with the potential effects of the refuge light goose hunting program on their own hunting properties or opportunities.</p>	This alternative may negatively impact public perception of the refuge by those who question why we are <u>not</u> having a light goose hunt on the refuge in order to do our part to address the light goose problem.	<p>Limited conflict is expected from the non-consumptive recreational public that utilizes the refuge.</p> <p>Other limited public conflict may include complaints from owners/users of local duck clubs neighboring the Refuge and local hunters who may be concerned with the potential effects of the refuge light goose hunting program on their own hunting properties or opportunities.</p>	<p>Limited conflict is expected from the non-consumptive recreational public that utilizes the refuge.</p> <p>Other limited public conflict may include complaints from owners/users of local duck clubs neighboring the Refuge and local hunters who may be concerned with the potential effects of the refuge light goose hunting program on their own hunting properties or opportunities.</p>

5. List of Preparers

Frank Durbian
Refuge Wildlife Biologist
Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge
PO Box 158
Mound City, MO 64470-0158

Ron Bell
Refuge Manager
Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge
PO Box 158
Mound City, MO 64470-0158

6. Consultation and Coordination with the Public and Others

Name	Title	Affiliation	Topic
Dave Erickson	Chief, Wildlife Division	Missouri Department of Conservation	Hunting Plan
Andrew Raedeke	State Waterfowl Biologist	Missouri Department of Conservation	Hunting Plan
Mitch Miller	Regional Supervisor, Wildlife Division	Missouri Department of Conservation	Hunting Plan
Charles Scott	Field Supervisor, Ecological services	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Threatened and Endangered Species

7. Public Comments on Draft EA/EIS and Responses

This section will be completed for the final EA after the public comment period.

8. References Cited

Abraham, K.F., R.L. Jefferies, R.F. Rockwell and C.D. Machines. 1996. Why are there so many white geese in North America? Pages 79-92 in J. Ratty (editor). Proceedings of the 7th International Waterfowl Symposium. Ducks Unlimited, Memphis, Tennessee.

Arnold, A. 1997. Mid-continent Lesser Snow Goose workshops Central and Mississippi flyway. Workshop Report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Migratory Bird Management and Division of Refuges. 66pp.

Batt, B.D. 1997. Arctic ecosystems in peril: Report of the arctic goose habitat working group. Arctic Goose Joint Venture Special Publication. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Washington, D.C. and Canadian Wildlife Service, Ottawa, Ontario. 120pp.

Sharp, D.E. and T.J. Moser. 2000. Light geese in the central flyway. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado. 34pp.

Squaw Creek NWR. 2004. Draft comprehensive conservation plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mound City, Missouri.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2004. Draft environmental impact statement: Light goose management. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 255 pp + appendices.

DRAFT

FIGURE 1. Map of Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge and light goose hunting area.

